

~~SECRET~~

ANNEX II - EDITORIAL REPORT

1. During FY 1950 the Editorial Branch, NIS Division, received from contributors 398 NIS sections, and cleared to Publication Branch 311 sections. This compared with approximately 130 sections received and 70 sections cleared to Publication Branch in the seven months between receipt of initial NIS contributions and the end of FY 1949.

2. The 311 sections actually processed by the Editorial Branch during FY 1950 were on 36 individual NIS Areas: 40 sections on the USSR were the largest block; next in order were 27 sections on Sweden, 19 on Denmark, and 17 each on Libya and Turkey. The largest total by topic was 17 section 37's (Civil Air); next in order were 13 section 38's (Telecommunications) and 11 section 25's (Towns); there were 9 each section 83's (Air Forces) and section 36's (Merchant Marine). Individual sections ranged in size from less than 10 manuscript pages for several to over 1500 manuscript pages for the section on Coasts and Landing Beaches for one of the four USSR regions. Of the 311 sections sent to Publication Branch, Army contributed 38%, State 27%, Air Force 13%, CIA Map Division 11%, Navy 11%.

3. Incoming and outgoing flow of material during FY 1950, monthly, is shown by graph (D). Sections cleared to the Publication Branch included some material received during the preceding fiscal year, and did not include roughly 50 sections received during FY 1950 but at the end of the year not returned from contributor revision, in various stages of editorial processing, or awaiting processing. Including 29 sections awaiting contributor re-working (after editorial work at least equivalent to average completed processing), the Editorial Branch completed an average of approximately 28 sections per month. This was an average of slightly more than one section per working day, and approximately 3 sections per month per editor on duty. Editorial completions in March were abnormally high because of moving a number of sections previously largely edited but held for various reasons. Completions for the last six months of FY 1950 gave a practical indication of editorial capability under present conditions of around 35 sections per month. The comparison of the 1950 incoming and outgoing flow with a 40-per-month line (graph D) indicates the considerable improvement which will be required to meet the projected FY 1951 schedule of approximately 40 sections per month.

~~SECRET~~

4. The basic FY 1950 pattern of NIS contributions is indicated by the following recapitulation of sections processed by the Editorial Branch:

<u>Category of Material</u>	<u>Sections Processed</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
I Requiring only reasonable editing and liaison with contributors	105	31%
II Requiring extended Editorial checking plus extensive coordination with contributors and major cumulative delay (Including 10 sections awaiting contributor re-working following initial editing)	149	44%
III Returned to contributors as requiring major re-working, or requiring an equivalent extent of joint correction and re-working (Including 19 sections awaiting contributor re-working following initial editing)	86	25%
	<u>340</u>	<u>100%</u>

5. The distribution of the same categories, in terms of the four agencies of primary responsibility and CIA Map Division, was:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Sections Processed</u>	<u>C a t e g o r y</u>		
		<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>
Army	135	40	55	40
State	92	25	39	28
CIA	36	24	12	0
Air Force	38	8	21	9
Navy	<u>39</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>9</u>
	340	105	149	86

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

6. Of the 311 sections cleared to the Publication Branch, less than 35% were adequate, with reasonable editing, to meet first-phase minimum NIS requirements. The relative term "reasonable" does not imply that sections in Category I generally met longer-term NIS qualitative standards in presentation and particularly substance. The results of Categories II and III processing were similarly relative in view of the practical limitations on the improvement possible without seriously delaying NIS production.

7. The above qualitative evaluation and processing aspects were generally comparable to FY 1949 experience, although qualitative evaluation was somewhat more lenient on the initial contributions processed during FY 1949. There was improvement in some types of material during FY 1950, not only in reduced errors but in substance and presentation. This was counter-balanced, however, by at best nominal improvement in other types of material, particularly for Chapter III (Transportation and Telecommunications), and by qualitative deficiencies in types of material received in quantity for the first time in FY 1950, notably for Chapters IV (Sociological), V (Political), and VI (Economic). Qualitative category distribution of sections approved for publication, indicates some improvement in category relationships over the course of FY 1950.

8. As in 1949, deficiencies in material were only nominally chargeable to contributor unfamiliarity with NIS format and general content concepts. No sections were returned to contributors on the basis of writing style or failure to conform in detail to the NIS outline. No sections were classified in Categories II or III on the basis of mutual rearrangement of material, or when contributors took the initiative for revision.

9. Continuing experience from receipt of the initial NIS contributions, the 1950 deficiency which was principal, pervasive, and unacceptably time-consuming for both the Editorial Branch and contributors, was elementary and essentially careless errors in text, tabular data, and graphic material. Many of these were significant. Others were of a type which, while not necessarily of individual significant magnitude, were cumulatively capable of jeopardizing general credibility of NIS material. Editorial detection of such deficiencies in line-by-line examination, which proved to be the only adequate procedure for the bulk of contributions,

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

and the Editorial Branch and contributor time consumed in correction -- with such time rising in geometrical proportion to cumulative time-lag after material left the original authors -- not only seriously delayed over-all movement of NIS material to Publication Branch but precluded more fundamental improvement in the substance and adequacy of the NIS.

10. Another continued deficiency was excessive contributor reliance on relatively old material, much of which had previously been published. Frequently no reference was made to more recently available issues of official yearbooks or similar material used as principal sources. There was an evident related tendency to accord priority to material because it was "intelligence", even if fragmentary and uncoordinated, without making reasonable and constructive use of commercial sources such as well-established trade journals. Appropriate use of the latter often would have given a more professional level of treatment to NIS contributions than ones which have been prepared by non-technical authors. There was limited evidence of information from World War II experience, Service reports, photography, and historical material. With a few and encouraging exceptions, this was particularly noticeable with respect to photography. There was a pervasive contributor tendency to use existing tabular and graphic material without appropriate adaptation for the NIS. There was a general predilection to use large and elaborate maps which detracted from graphic value. Chapters IV (Sociological) and V (Political) material presented editorial difficulties in obtaining less emotional phraseology and more objectivity and perspective in presentation. In certain Chapter III (Transportation and Telecommunications) sections, Editorial Branch has had to guard consistently against a tendency toward too brief and generalized treatment even when considerable data were available to the contributor.

11. While the Editorial Branch is not sufficiently informed to determine the factors responsible for deficiencies in contributions, such factors have been indicated in processing of the material and working-level conferences with author and coordinating personnel. Working-level personnel have almost unanimously cited as a prime factor unrealistic assigned production schedules and insistence on their being met. On the basis of the effective manpower and the inherent difficulty in preparing basic intelligence material, the initial production schedules were highly unrealistic and in any

-20-

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

event must have largely precluded even nominal additional research to incorporate more recent and more comprehensive data. Even so, Editorial Branch saw many instances where, in terms of total time involved in a contribution, a negligible additional amount of time would have considerably improved photographic material. There were other instances where preliminary reference to trade-journals or comparable types of available well-organized presentations would actually have saved time and produced better NIS material. There was indication that, on the one hand, certain material requiring relatively mature author experience and capability had been prepared by around GS-7 level personnel, without effective subsequent review. Certain other material appeared, on the other hand, to have been prepared by more mature authors, but not subjected to lower-echelon detailed examination which Editorial Branch was forced to perform. When Editorial Branch found many significant errors in one section, the originating office stated that relatively inexperienced personnel had prepared the material. The section, however, had been forwarded without appropriate additional review provisions, and without informing the Editorial Branch of the situation. Generally speaking, by more or less recognized default Editorial Branch was delegated detailed checking and substantive responsibilities of NIS author and coordinator echelons.

12. Contributor as well as editorial problems were increased by the above circumstances. In many cases the process of correcting errors and deficiencies some time after author completion, involving identification of and efforts to re-obtain original source material, undoubtedly required more contributor man-hours than the time necessary for adequate original preparation. These multiple problems affected all contributors to varying extents, but converged on the Editorial Branch. Experience demonstrated that, even with the Category I contributions, it was necessary for the Editorial Branch to make line-by-line and item-by-item check of submitted material. In most cases, significant factual inconsistencies and errors were not obvious from the mass of material concerned, and required at least summary cross-check with other NIS or other material. Experience further showed that nearly comparable checking was required on re-submitted Categories II and III material. An estimated 400 editorial hours were required to demonstrate the deficiencies which led the agency concerned to recommend complete revision of one major section after the section presumably had been once revised. A number of re-submissions were returned to contributors a second time. It was consistent editorial policy to avoid the extensive re-writing of

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

material which would have been the more expeditious means of raising the qualitative level of material. The alternative procedure of providing detailed guidance but not diminishing the responsibility of the contributors for actually preparing acceptable material was more time-consuming and demanding of Editorial Branch manpower but was in the long-range interest of fundamental improvement in basic intelligence. Within the limitations on time imposed by the necessity for getting material into published form, editorial personnel not only conferred with contributors on individual sections but participated in a series of more generalized conferences with author and coordinator personnel which proved effective in resolving detailed problems and concurrently in developing practical working-level understanding of NIS concepts.

13. Contributor-coordinator-Editorial Branch relationship has been generally good and, in view of the extent and nature of the problems cited above, remarkably so. Although there have been instances of initial contributor misunderstanding of necessarily brief and non-exhaustive editorial comments on submitted material, there has been general acceptance of this procedure. Various contributors have recently shown initiative in developing improvements, notably in obtaining excellent photography for certain NIS sections.

14. Incorporating BGN recommendations has continued to present major and shifting problems. BGN working-level personnel have shown willing cooperation in developing practical solutions, however, and the problems should not get out of hand.

15. GPO aspects, as channeled through Publication Branch, have shown gradual improvement. General pressure on Editorial Branch has resulted in GPO receiving copy deficient in consistency and not as clean as it should be. On the other hand, GPO proof-reading has varied considerably in adequacy, and NIS appearance has suffered from GPO lack of adaptability in make-up. In response to consistent pressure, it now appears that GPO has adopted procedures which should produce better multi-photograph insert pages.

~~SECRET~~